

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-4033

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 16-4041

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 16-4042

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. W. Earl Britt, Senior District Judge. (5:14-cr-00240-BR-1)

Submitted: June 21, 2016

Decided: July 8, 2016

Before DUNCAN, KEENAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed in part; dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William Scott Davis, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Ethan A. Ontjes, Assistant United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, William Scott Davis, Jr., seeks to appeal the magistrate judge's pretrial detention order, the district court's oral order denying 33 motions, and the district court's written order denying 38 other motions in his pending criminal matter. This Court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2012), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2012); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). This Court has jurisdiction only over Davis' appeal from the district court's order denying his pro se motion to vacate the magistrate judge's detention order. See 18 U.S.C. § 3145(c) (2012). All other orders Davis seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. Accordingly, we dismiss Davis' appeals of these orders for lack of jurisdiction.

Turning to the district court's denial of Davis' motion to vacate, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Davis' informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's denial of his motion to vacate the detention order, Davis has forfeited appellate review of that denial. See Williams v. Giant Food Inc., 370 F.3d 423, 430 n.4 (4th Cir.

2004). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order denying Davis' motion to vacate the detention order.

We deny Davis' motions to consolidate additional appeals, to appoint counsel, and for transcript at government expense. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this Court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED IN PART;
DISMISSED IN PART